

<sup>2</sup> See Monell v. Dep't of Soc. Servs., 436 U.S. 658 (1978).

Rinscott Corp. v. Fine Arts Funding Inc., No. 80-cv-6779 (RLC), 1981 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 15868, at \*2-3 (S.D.N.Y. Nov. 17, 1981). Plaintiff's use of Rule 30(a) is proper.

Plaintiff also has established that the requested depositions are relevant and not overly prejudicial. Plaintiff has adequately explained the information he expects each noticed deponent to provide and its relevance to the Monell claims.

Finally, the depositions are not disproportionately burdensome. The Court has instructed plaintiff to convey to defendants before each deposition the topics to be covered, the cases to be discussed, and the documents to be used, thereby narrowing the scope of the depositions and ensuring that they are proportional to the needs of the case. Discovery in this case was bifurcated between the Monell and non-Monell claims, and these are the first depositions plaintiff is seeking on the Monell claims.<sup>3</sup> Further, the Court has instructed plaintiff to withdraw one deposition notice in order to bring the number of depositions down to ten. See Fed. R. Civ. P. 30(a).

Defendants have not established good cause for a protective order as required by Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 26(c)(1). Defendants' motion is denied.

**SO ORDERED:**

*Peggy Kuo*

PEGGY KUO

United States Magistrate Judge

Dated: Brooklyn, New York  
February 18, 2016

---

<sup>3</sup> Because discovery was bifurcated, witnesses were not asked questions with regard to the Monell claims during the non-Monell phase of discovery.